

**IN THE MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

---

**COMPLETE TITLE OF CASE**

STATE OF MISSOURI,

Respondent,

v.

DANIEL O. MAUCHENHEIMER,

Appellant.

---

**DOCKET NUMBER WD72913**

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

**DATE:** June 21, 2011

---

**APPEAL FROM**

The Circuit Court of Boone County, Missouri  
The Honorable Jodie C. Asel, Judge

---

**JUDGES**

Division II: Smart, P.J., and Pfeiffer and Martin, JJ.

CONCURRING.

---

**ATTORNEYS**

Chris Koster, Attorney General  
Daniel N. McPherson, Assistant Attorney General  
Jefferson City, MO

Attorneys for Respondent,

Tamara Putnam and J. Denise Carter  
Lee's Summit, MO

Attorneys for Appellant.

---



## MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

### MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS, WESTERN DISTRICT

STATE OF MISSOURI, )  
)  
Respondent, )  
v. ) **OPINION FILED:**  
) **June 21, 2011**  
DANIEL O. MAUCHENHEIMER, )  
)  
Appellant. )

WD72913

Boone County

**Before Division Two Judges:** James M. Smart, Jr., Presiding Judge, and  
Mark D. Pfeiffer and Cynthia L. Martin, Judges

Daniel Mauchenheimer appeals his conviction after a jury trial for attempted sexual misconduct involving a child by indecent exposure, § 566.083 RSMo Cum. Supp. 2008, for which he was sentenced to four years imprisonment. In his sole point on appeal, Mauchenheimer asserts that the trial court erred in denying his motion for additional discovery under Rule 25.04(A), wherein he sought access to the hard drive of the computer used by the detective in his undercover investigation that led to Mauchenheimer's criminal charge.

**AFFIRMED.**

#### **DIVISION TWO HOLDS:**

Given the overwhelming evidence that Mauchenheimer engaged in sexually explicit internet chats with and exposed himself via webcam to a person he thought was a fourteen-year-old girl, and given that Mauchenheimer did not show that the State possessed the allegedly missing portions of the conversations he sought or that the defense did not already have access to the same information claimed to be in possession of the State, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying Mauchenheimer's discovery motion.

**OPINION BY:** Mark D. Pfeiffer, Judge

June 21, 2011

\*\*\*\*\*

THIS SUMMARY IS **UNOFFICIAL** AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.